

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/025,509	KESSLER ET AL.
	Examiner Nadia Khoshnoodi	Art Unit 2137

All Participants:

Status of Application: First Action after RCE

(1) Nadia Khoshnoodi

(3) Mr. Chris Mooney

(2) Mr. Dan De Vos

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 30 January 2007

Time: 12:00 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 101 rejections found in reference to all independent claims

Claims discussed:

all independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Nadia Khoshnoodi

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that the claims have 35 USC 101 issues where if the issues are resolved claims 1-5 and 11-30 would be allowable over the cited prior arts of record. The independent claims as presented do not result in a tangible/useful result. However, if every independent claim is amended to include a limitation which establishes a secure connection between two entities by using the data generated based on the information supplied, the 35 USC 101 issues will be overcome. Furthermore, Examiner noted that claims 6-10 and 31-34 were not, as presented, patentably distinct over the prior art. Thus, Mr. De Vos suggested some amendments that would possibly put those claims in condition for allowance. Examiner mentioned that once the proposed amendments to the claims are received, an updated search must be conducted and the Examiner will need to also discuss the claims with a Primary Examiner before submitting the allowance with an Examiner's Amendment.